

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

DRUSILLA A JONES,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 24-cv-1380-bhl

v.

COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY
ADMINISTRATION, et al,

Defendants.

ORDER

On October 28, 2024, Plaintiff Drusilla A. Jones filed a complaint seeking review of a decision of the Commissioner for Social Security. (ECF No. 1.) That same day, she also filed a motion for leave to proceed without prepaying the filing fee or *in forma pauperis* (IFP) using the Court's local form. (ECF No. 2.) On November 7, 2024, the Court screened the complaint and concluded that Jones had not provided sufficient information in her IFP motion for the Court to determine if she is able to pay the filing fee. (ECF No. 4.) Accordingly, the Court denied her motion to proceed IFP, but with leave to refile with more detailed information concerning her financial situation. (*Id.*) The Court also noted that Jones appeared to be misrepresenting that she is an attorney and cautioned her against continuing to do so. (*Id.* at 2.)

On December 6, 2024, Jones filed an amended complaint, (ECF No. 5), and a renewed IFP motion. (ECF No. 6.) Both filings were again problematic. Jones continued to represent that she is an attorney and listed "The Law Firm of Drusilla Jones Principal LLC" as a plaintiff. (ECF No. 5 at 1.) She also reported that she is unemployed. (ECF No. 6 at 1.) She reported no specific information concerning her income, assets, or expenses, other than claiming an incredible "\$50mil" expense for "civil and criminal litigation." (ECF No. 6 at 2.)

On December 11, 2024, the Court ordered Jones to show cause by December 26, 2024, for her refusal to provide the Court with accurate financial information and her ongoing efforts to misrepresent herself as an attorney. (ECF No. 7.) The Court warned Jones that failure to comply

with its order would result in dismissal of her case. (*Id.* at 2.) Jones has not responded to that order, either before or after the deadline. Accordingly, her case will be dismissed. Because Jones has repeatedly provided the Court with false information concerning her financial status and continued to misrepresent herself as an attorney, dismissal with prejudice is appropriate. *See Thomas v. Gen. Motors Acceptance Corp.*, 288 F.3d 305, 306 (7th Cir. 2002).

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this case is **DISMISSED with prejudice** for Plaintiff's failure to show cause for her repeated misrepresentations to the Court. The Clerk is directed to enter judgment accordingly.

Dated at Milwaukee, Wisconsin on January 3, 2025.

s/ Brett H. Ludwig
BRETT H. LUDWIG
United States District Judge